UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/682,645	10/08/2003	Jessica Kahn	18602-08111	8234

61520 7590 02/23/2007

APPLE/FENWICK
SILLICON VALLEY CENTER
801 CALIFORNIA STREET
MOUNTAIN VIEW, CA 94041

EXAMINER	
TRAN, TUYETLIEN T	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2179	

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	02/23/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/682,645	KAHN, JESSICA	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	TuyetLien (Lien) T. Tran	2179	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *20 December 2006*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-4,11-26,28-49,51-64 and 66-74* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-4, 11-26, 28-49, 51-64 and 66-74* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to the following communication: Amendment filed 12/20/06.

This action is made final.

2. Claims 1-4, 11-26, 28-49, 51-64 and 66-74 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 46, 60 and 61 are independent claims. Claims 1-4, 19, 34-35, 40, 45-49, 51-52, 54-55, 59-61, 63-64, 69-70, and 74 are the amended claims.

Claim Objections

3. Applicant's amendment corrects the previous claim objections and therefore the objections are dropped.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. Claim 8 is cancelled and therefore the 112 rejection is withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

5. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

> Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 60-74 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

As to claims 60 and 61, a "system" is being recited; however, it appears that the system would reasonably be interpreted by one of ordinary skill in the art as software, per se. The only element positively recited as part of the system is the "detector". Applicant's specification provides no explicit and deliberate definition of the detector, and it appears that such would reasonably be interpreted as representative of the software which tracks user behavior with

respect to a user interface. As such, it believed that the system of claims 60 and 61 is reasonably interpreted as functional descriptive material, per se.

Claims 62-74 are rejected as incorporating the deficiencies of a claim upon which it depends.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

7. Claims 1-3, 11-15, 17-23, 30, 34-38, 41-48, 51-63 and 66-74 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Lehmeier et al (Patent No. US 6981242 B2; hereinafter Lehmeier).

As to claims 1, 46 and 60, Lehmeier teaches:

A computer-implemented user interface configuration method, system and product (e.g., see col. 2 lines 26-30), comprising:

a computer-readable medium; computer program code, encoded on the medium for (e.g., see col. 5 lines 46-60):

detecting a user proficiency level with respect to a user interface based on user behavior with respect to the user interface (i.e., see steps 504-516 in Fig. 5 and col. 7 lines 46-67); and

automatically configuring at least one functional component of the user interface responsive to the detected proficiency level (e.g., see steps 518-520 in Fig. 5 and col. 8 lines 23-40).

As to claim 61, Lehmeier teaches:

A system for configuring a user interface (e.g., see col. 2 lines 26-30), comprising:

a user proficiency level detector (e.g., items 130 and 140 in Fig. 2), for detecting a user proficiency level with respect to a user interface based on user behavior with respect to the user interface (i.e., see steps 504-516 in Fig. 5 and col. 7 lines 46-67); and

a user interface configuration module (i.e., items 150, 110, 120 in Fig. 2), coupled to the user proficiency level detector (e.g., items 130 and 140 in Fig. 2), for automatically configuring at least one functional component of the user interface responsive to the detected proficiency level (e.g., see steps 518-520 in Fig. 5 and col. 8 lines 23-40).

As to claims 2, 47 and 62, Lehmeier further teaches selecting at least one configuration option from a plurality of configuration options (i.e., see col. 3 lines 15-24).

As to claims 3, 48 and 63, Lehmeier further teaches at least one selected from the group consisting of:

enabling access to a functional user interface element (i.e., see col. 8 lines 22-40 and Fig. 4C);

disabling access to a user functional interface element (i.e., see col. 8 lines 22-40 and col. 14 lines 20-23); and

changing an appearance of a functional user interface element (i.e., see col. 8 lines 22-40 and Fig. 4C).

As to claim 11, Lehmeier further teaches outputting a notification of a change to user interface configuration (e.g., see Fig. 3D and Fig. 4C).

As to claim 12, Lehmeier teaches outputting a notification of at least one newly enable user interface feature (i.e., see col. 11 lines 24-40).

As to claims 13, 51 and 66, Lehmeier further teaches wherein detecting the user proficiency level and automatically configuring the user interface are performed responsive to a trigger event (e.g., see col. 11 lines 18-23 and Fig. 5).

As to claim 14, Lehmeier further teaches wherein the trigger event comprises user input requesting user interface configuration (e.g., see col. 13 lines 22-45).

As to claim 15, Lehmeier discloses wherein the trigger event comprises application startup (e.g., steps 504-510 in Fig. 5).

As to claim 17, Lehmeier teaches wherein the trigger event comprises a change in user behavior with respect to the user interface (i.e., steps 512-520 in Fig. 5).

As to claim 18, Lehmeier teaches wherein the trigger event comprises user logon (e.g., see col. 13 lines 22-45).

As to claims 19, 52 and 67, Lehmeier further teaches detecting the user proficiency level and automatically configuring the user interface are performed periodically (e.g., see col. 14 lines 65-67 and steps 512-520 in Fig. 5).

As to claims 20, 53 and 68, Lehmeier further teaches reading a stored user proficiency level derived from at least one marker (i.e., see col. 7 lines 22-45 and col. 13 lines 22-31).

As to claim 21, Lehmeier further teaches wherein the marker indicates historical usage of the user interface (e.g., see col. 7 lines 22-45 and col. 13 lines 22-31).

As to claim 22, Lehmeier further teaches detecting whether a user interface element has been used (e.g., see col. 7 lines 22-45).

As to claim 23, Lehmeier further teaches detecting whether a user interface element has been used a number of times exceeding a predetermined threshold (i.e., see col. 7 lines 46-67).

As to claim 30, Lehmeier teaches detecting a user-specified preference indicating a proficiency level (e.g., see col. 13 lines 22-45).

As to claims 34, 54 and 69, Lehmeier further teaches:

detecting the user proficiency level comprises detecting the user proficiency level with respect to a user interface component less than the entire user interface (e.g., see col. 7 lines 22-67); and

automatically configuring the at least one functional component of the user interface comprises automatically configuring the user interface component without altering the configuration of the remainder of the user interface (i.e., step 518 in Fig. 5 and Fig. 4C).

As to claims 35, 55 and 70, Lehmeier further teaches:

detecting the user proficiency level comprises detecting the user proficiency level with respect to an application (i.e., see step 504-506 in Fig. 5 and col. 13 lines 22-45); and

automatically configuring the at least one functional component of the user interface comprises automatically configuring the user interface for the application (i.e., steps 510 and 520 in Fig. 5).

As to claims 36, 56 and 71, Lehmeier further teaches:

responsive to user behavior with respect to the user interface, storing a marker indicating a user proficiency level (e.g., see steps 512-524 in Fig. 5);

and wherein detecting the user proficiency level comprises reading the stored marker (i.e., steps 502-506 in Fig. 5 and col. 13 lines 22-45).

As to claim 37, Lehmeier further teaches storing the marker is performed by a first application (e.g., see col. 8 lines 5-21); and

reading the stored marker is performed by a background process (e.g., see col. 7 lines 46-67).

As to claim 38, Lehmeier further teaches:

storing the marker is performed by a first application (e.g., col. 14 lines 28-50); and

reading the stored marker is performed by a second application different from the first application (e.g., col. 14 lines 28-50).

As to claim 41, Lehmeier further teaches:

storing the marker is performed by an operating system (e.g., col. 14 lines 28-50); and

reading the stored marker is performed by an application (e.g., col. 14 lines 28-50).

As to claims 42, 57 and 72, Lehmeier further teaches retrieving a plurality of stored markers and aggregating the retrieved markers to derive a proficiency level (e.g., see col. 8 lines 5-21).

As to claims 43, 58 and 73, Lehmeier further teaches responsive to user behavior with respect to the user interface, storing a plurality of markers (e.g., see col. 8 lines 5-21 and Fig. 5);

And wherein retrieving at least a subset of the stored markers and aggregating the retrieved markers to derive a proficiency level (e.g., see col. 8 lines 5-21).

As to claim 44, Lehmeier teaches further comprising:

accepting user input overriding the user interface configuration and specifying a desired configuration (e.g., see col. 13 lines 22-45); and

responsive to the user input, configuring the user interface according to the desired configuration (e.g., see col. 13 lines 22-45).

As to claims 45, 59 and 74, Lehmeier further teaches:

detecting a user proficiency level with respect to a user interface of a web-resident application being run from a client machine (i.e., see steps 504-516 in Fig. 5 and col. 7 lines 46-67 and col. 3 lines 30-38); and

automatically configuring the at least one functional user interface element for the web-resident application (e.g., see steps 518-520 in Fig. 5 and col. 8 lines 23-40 and col. 3 lines 30-38).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 4, 16, 39, 49, and 64 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lehmeier in view of Howe et al (Patent No. US 6,917,958 B1, hereinafter simply referred to as Howe).

As to claims 4, 49 and 64, Lehmeier teaches the limitation of claims 1, 46 and 61 for the reasons as discussed with respect to claims 1, 46 and 61 above. Lehmeier further teaches at least one selected from the group consisting of:

enabling access to a command (e.g., see col. 8 lines 22-40 and col. 11 lines 24-40);

disabling access to a command (e.g., see col. 8 lines 22-40 and col. 14 lines 15-27);

changing an appearance of a command (i.e., see Fig. 4C);

enabling access to a menu (e.g., see col. 8 lines 22-40 and col. 11 lines 24-40);

disabling access to a menu (e.g., see col. 8 lines 22-40 and col. 14 lines 15-27);

changing an appearance of a menu (i.e., see Fig. 4C);

enabling access to a button (e.g., see col. 8 lines 22-40 and col. 11 lines 24-40);

disabling access to a button (e.g., see col. 8 lines 22-40 and col. 14 lines 15-27);

changing an appearance of a button (i.e., see Fig. 4C);

However, Lehmeier fails to explicitly disclose enabling, disabling access to a shortcut. Howe teaches:

enabling access to a shortcut (i.e., application packages which includes shortcuts are made available to users who are logged on, see col. 8, lines 37-44);

disabling access to a shortcut (i.e., application packages are not available to users who are not logged on , see col. 8, lines 37-44 or whose user profile indicates that a shortcut to a particular application is not needed, see col. 8, lines 47-50).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have utilized the method of automatically configuring access to a shortcut as taught by Howe to the user interface configuration method as taught by Lehmeier to provide the users the ability to have access to shortcuts of applications wherever they are located to improve productivity through the use of a variety of distributed computing resources (see Howe col. 1, lines 60-63 and col. 2, lines 30-35).

As to claim 16, Lehmeier teaches the limitation of claim 13 for the reasons as discussed with respect to claim 13 above. However, Lehmeier does not disclose the trigger event comprises system startup. Howe teaches wherein the trigger event comprises system startup (i.e., upon startup of client computer, user profile 458 may be set from the server to a client to customize a client computer for a specific user, see col. 8, lines 31-50). Thus combining Lehmeier and Howe would meet the claimed limitation for the same reasons as discussed with respect to claim 4 above.

As to claim 39, Lehmeier teaches the limitation of claim 36 for the reasons as discussed with respect to claim 36 above. However, Lehmeier does not teach that storing and reading the marker is performed by an operating system. Howe discloses:

storing the marker is performed by an operating system (e.g., User Profile 548 is stored in a server which is controlled by an operating system as shown in Fig. 4); and

reading the stored marker is performed by the operating system (i.e., upon startup of client computer, the server decides whether specific users can access specific applications, see col. 8, lines 31-40). Thus combining Lehmeier and Howe would meet the claimed limitation for the same reasons as discussed with respect to claim 4 above.

10. Claim 40 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lehmeier in view of Howe further in view of Lanier et al (Patent No US RE37,431 E; hereinafter Lanier).

As to claim 40, Lehmeier and Howe teach the limitation of claim 39 for the reasons as discussed with respect to claim 39 above. Lehmeier and Howe fail to expressly teach modifying functional user interface elements that are supplied to a plurality of applications. Lanier, though, teaches automatically configuring the at least one functional component of the user interface comprises modifying functional user interface elements that are supplied to a plurality of applications (e.g., see col. 2 lines 1-11).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have utilized the method of method of providing intelligent help menu as taught by Lanier to the user interface configuration method as taught by Lehmeier and Howe to provide help information that is relevant to the user's level of understanding or experience and the current activities that he or she has executed (e.g., see Lanier col. 2 lines 1-11).

11. Claims 25-26, 28-29 and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lehmeier in view of Morrison (Publication No. US 2003/0030668 A1, hereinafter simply referred to as Morrison).

As to claim 25, Lehmeier teaches the limitation of claim 1 for the reasons as discussed with respect to claim 1 above. However, Lehmeier does not mention detecting how many applications are open concurrently. Morrison teaches wherein detecting the user proficiency level comprises detecting how many applications are open concurrently (i.e., by reading the timestamp information of the cookies, a program can determine how many files are open

concurrently; it is noted that files are displayed by an application either from the graphical user interface or from outside of the help system, see [0028]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have used the method of displaying a customized presentation of help files as taught by Morrison to the user interface configuration method as taught by Lehmeier to allow the user to customize his or her use of the help system and thus view information tailored to his or her needs (see Morrison [0018]).

As to claim 26, Lehmeier teaches the limitation of claim 1 for the reasons as discussed with respect to claim 1 above. However, Lehmeier does not mention detecting a historical average number of concurrently open applications. Morrison teaches wherein detecting the user proficiency level comprises detecting a historical average number of concurrently open applications (i.e., based on the timestamp information, a program can count how many applications are open concurrently at any period of time, see [0028]). Thus combining Lehmeier and Morrison would meet the claimed limitation for the same reasons as discussed with respect to claim 25 above.

As to claim 28, this claim differs from claim 25 only in that claim 28 recites the limitation "windows" (it is noted that the help content is displayed within a browser window as shown in Fig. 3A) whereas claim 25 recites the limitation of "applications". Thus claim 28 is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to claim 25 above.

As to claim 29, this claim differs from claim 26 only in that claim 29 recites the limitation "windows" (it is noted that the help content is displayed within a browser window as shown in Fig. 3A) whereas claim 26 recites the limitation of "applications". Thus claim 29 is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to claim 26 above.

As to claim 33, Lehmeier teaches the limitation of claim 1 for the reasons as discussed with respect to claim 1 above. Lehmeier further teaches that detecting a user proficiency level and automatically configuring at least one functional component of the user interface responsive to the detected proficiency level can be operable on a web-based application. However, Lehmeier fails to expressly teaches detecting historical usage of web pages having active content. Morrison teaches wherein detecting the user proficiency level comprises detecting historical usage of web pages having active content (e.g., by reading the data from the history file, a program can determine if the file is opened in the past, see [0028]). Thus combining Lehmeier and Morrison would meet the claimed limitation for the same reasons as discussed with respect to claim 25 above.

12. Claims 24 and 31-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lehmeier in view of Aleksander et al (Patent No. US 7,080,321 B2, hereinafter simply referred to as Alexsander).

As to claim 24, Lehmeier teaches the limitation of claim 1 for the reasons as discussed with respect to claim 1 above. However, Lehmeier does not disclose detecting a total amount of time spent by a user using an application. Aleksander teaches wherein detecting the user proficiency level comprises detecting a total amount of time spent by a user using an application (i.e., the time a customer spends on particular web pages displayed by a browser application, see col. 2, lines 25-30).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have used the method of determining the level of proficiency as taught by Aleksander to the user interface configuration method as taught by Lehmeier to prevent the customer from

leaving the company web site by providing a user interface that the user may find it easy to navigate and to obtain the desired information for a product or service (see Aleksander col. 3, lines 35-37 and col. 1, lines 18-24).

As to claim 31, Lehmeier teaches the limitation of claim 1 for the reasons as discussed with respect to claim 1 above. However, Lehmeier fails to disclose detecting web page visitation patterns. Aleksander teaches wherein detecting the user proficiency level comprises detecting web page visitation patterns (e.g., number of times that a customer returns to the web page, see col. 3, lines 21-25). Thus combining Lehmeier and Aleksander would meet the claimed limitation for the same reasons as discussed with respect to claim 24 above.

As to claim 32, Lehmeier teaches the limitation of claim 1 for the reasons as discussed with respect to claim 1 above. However, Lehmeier fails to disclose detecting historical usage of secure web pages. Aleksander teaches detecting historical usage of secure web pages (see col. 6, lines 50-62). Thus combining Lehmeier and Aleksander would meet the claimed limitation for the same reasons as discussed with respect to claim 24 above.

Response to Arguments

13. Applicant's arguments regarding claims 1-3, 11-15, 17-18, 20-23, 30, 34-37, 44, 46-48, 51, 53-56, 60-63, 66, 68-69, 70-71 have been considered but are moot in new ground of rejection. In view of amendment, the references of Lehmeier and Lanier have been added for the new ground of rejection.

- Applicant argues that the examiner fails to provide any justification for the 101 rejection (see remark page 1 and 2).

The Examiner respectfully disagrees.

The Examiner clearly points out that the system recited in claim 60 and 61 is taught to be **software, per se**. The Examiner further indicates that there is no physical and tangible interrelationship between computer elements and software module. In addition, the Examiner would like to point out that even though the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. As such, the system recited in claim 60 and 61 is interpreted as software, per se and are non-statutory subject matter. Please refer to paragraph 5 in this office action for further explanation.

- Applicant's argument that there is no hint or suggesting in Howe of any automatic configuration of a user interface that comprises enabling or disabling access to a shortcut (see remark page 8).

The Examiner respectfully disagrees.

The Examiner would like to point out that only one limitation recited in claim 4 is required in order to meet the scope of the claim. In this case, the Examiner has addressed all the limitations taught either by Lehmeier or by Howe. Lehmeier teaches a method and system to configure a user interface, that allows:

enabling access to a command (e.g., see col. 8 lines 22-40 and col. 11 lines 24-40);

disabling access to a command (e.g., see col. 8 lines 22-40 and col. 14 lines 15-27);

changing an appearance of a command (i.e., see Fig. 4C);

enabling access to a menu (e.g., see col. 8 lines 22-40 and col. 11 lines 24-40);

disabling access to a menu (e.g., see col. 8 lines 22-40 and col. 14 lines 15-27);

changing an appearance of a menu (i.e., see Fig. 4C);

enabling access to a button (e.g., see col. 8 lines 22-40 and col. 11 lines 24-40);

disabling access to a button (e.g., see col. 8 lines 22-40 and col. 14 lines 15-27);

changing an appearance of a button (i.e., see Fig. 4C);

The Examiner then admits that Lehmeier does not expressly teach enabling, disabling access to a shortcut. However, Howe teaches a system and method for allowing changes to system files to be made at clients in a dynamic manner (e.g., col. 6 lines 50-55) that allows

enabling access to a shortcut (i.e., application packages which includes shortcuts are made available to users who are logged on, see col. 8, lines 37-44);

disabling access to a shortcut (i.e., application packages are not available to users who are not logged on , see col. 8, lines 37-44 or whose user profile indicates that a shortcut to a particular application is not needed, see col. 8, lines 47-50).

- Applicant's argument that Howe does not teach the limitation wherein the trigger event comprises system startup (see remark page 9).

The Examiner respectfully disagrees.

Howe clearly teaches upon startup of client computer, user profile 458 may be set from the server to a client to customize a client computer for a specific user, see col. 8, lines 31-50.

- Applicant's argument that Morrison does not teach detection of user proficiency level and automatic configuration of a functional component of a user interface responsive to the detected proficiency level (see remark pages 10-11).

The Examiner respectfully disagrees.

Morrison clearly teach detecting the user proficiency level (i.e., determining whether a user is experienced or has viewed similar help topic in the past, see [0031], lines 11-14) and automatically configuring the user interface (step 226 as shown in Fig. 2B) are performed periodically (i.e., link timeout as shown in step 224; it is noted that if the link time is greater than

the link timeout, the link will be removed from the currently displayed list as evidently shown in step 226).

Conclusion

14. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Examiner's note: Examiner has cited particular columns, line numbers, and figures in the references as applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teaching of the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to TuyetLien (Lien) T. Tran whose telephone number is 571-270-1033. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Friday: 7:30 - 5:00 (every other Friday off).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Weilun Lo can be reached on 571-272-4847. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

T.T
2/9/2007

Lien Tran
Examiner
Art Unit 2179